

Exemption of Petty Money-lenders from the Operation of the Money-lenders' Act.

Q.—121. Mr. K. RAMANNA (Holenarasipur—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the number of moneylenders in the State who registered their names in 1940-41 under the Act and the amount realised by Government as registration fees ;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Government had given an assurance in the Assembly at the time of discussion on the general principles of the Money-lenders Act that its provisions would not apply to petty money-lenders who did not follow money-lending as their profession ;

(c) whether it has come to their knowledge that great hardship and loss are caused under the provisions of the Act to petty money-lenders who did not follow money-lending as a profession and also to those who receive small loans from them ?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. V. Narayana Rao).—

(a) 22,488 Money-lenders ;
Rs. 95,817-3-0.

(b) No.

(c) No.

Mr. K. RAMANNA.—In spite of what is contained in the answer to (b), may I invite attention to the fact that an assurance was given, in the course of discussions at the last session of this House, that the Act would not apply to petty money-lenders ?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—No such assurance was given.

Mr. K. RAMANNA.—In the Act it is stated that the provisions about registration and licensing apply to all money-lenders. Will an assurance be given at least now that petty money-lenders will be exempted from the said provisions ?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—All professional money-lenders must obtain licenses and register themselves

Mr. K. RAMANNA.—But in the case of many persons, money-lending is not

their main profession. It is only a subsidiary occupation. Will they be exempted from the provisions of the Act relating to licence and registration ?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—The question whether a person is a money-lender or not is one for decision by courts. I cannot therefore answer that question. Besides, there are two things in it : registration and licensing. The one is quite different from the other. The licensing provisions—Chapters VII and VIII—have not been put into force as yet. Only the registration provision is in force now. More than all, even the provision about registration is meant to apply only to persons who are declared to be money-lenders

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Representation No. 116 refers to the point which the member is trying to make out. It may, therefore, be urged when that representation is taken up.

Construction of an Anecut across Simsha Halla.

Q.—137. Patel T. RUDRAPPA (Doddaballapur—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) when the estimate was prepared for constructing an *anecut* for the Simsha Halla, near Gudumagere Village, Sasalu Hobli, Doddaballapur Taluk ;

(b) the number of acres of wet lands to be irrigated from this project and the villages that will be supplied with water ;

(c) whether the Government intend taking up this project, and if so, whether they will take this up during the current year ?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. G. Mehkri).—

(a) In 1938-39.

(b) 600 acres in Gundagere, Ojenahalli, Hosakote, Sonnavahalli and Makthi of Doddaballapur Taluk.

(c) The project was ordered by Government to lie over as the raiyats were not agreeable to pay the acreage contribution of Rs. 100 in 10 instalments as required by Government

instead of 20 as per their *mutchalika* executed in September 1938.

Mr. T. RUDRAPPA.—What is the amount of the estimate?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Rs. 2,27,000.

Mr. T. RUDRAPPA.—Is there any chance of villages of Goribidnur Taluk also being supplied with water from this *anecut*?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—The villages that will be supplied with water are mentioned in the answer.

Mr. T. RUDRAPPA.—Will not the *anecut*, if constructed, be a great boon to the villages of Doddballapur Taluk?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Yes.

Mr. T. RUDRAPPA.—Then, why not construct the *anecut*?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—The difficulty is that the raiyats have not agreed to pay the contribution in ten instalments.

Mr. T. RUDRAPPA.—Are the Government aware that at present there are no irrigation facilities in the taluk?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—I cannot say.

Mr. T. RUDRAPPA.—Why not Government accept the offer of the raiyats to pay the contribution in 20 instalments instead of in ten?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—That question has not come up to Government.

Mr. T. RUDRAPPA.—Will it be considered?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—After Government have agreed to the scheme, that question may be considered.

Mr. T. RUDRAPPA.—Have no applications been received from the raiyats by Government in the matter?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—No.

Mr. SHAIK AHMED SAHIB.—Has it been definitely decided by Government that the contribution should be recovered in only ten instalments?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—No.

Mr. SHAIK AHMED SAHIB.—Then, cannot the number of instalments be increased now?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—It can be done by Government if they consider it necessary to do so.

Mr. SHAIK AHMED SAHIB.—It is stated that 600 acres of wet land will be brought under cultivation by the project. At the rate of Rs. 100, the Government stand to get as contribution a sum of

Rs. 60,000. Will the Government also contribute a share towards the construction of the *anecut*?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Yes.

Mr. SHAIK AHMED SAHIB.—The area is all jungle, and the lands at present cannot be converted into wet. The *anecut* will be of immense benefit to the raiyats. Therefore will the Government examine the scheme without delay?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—But the project, unfortunately, is not considered to be remunerative. That is why Government thought of taking up the work as a famine relief measure. The estimate has been prepared on that basis.

Mr. SHAIK AHMED SAHIB.—If all the 600 acres come under wet cultivation, what will the revenue be?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—About Rs. 4,300 a year.

Mr. SHAIK AHMED SAHIB.—Will it be considered as a major work?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—The expenditure involved is about Rs. 2½ lakhs. It may therefore be considered as a major work.

Grant of Lands in Grama Hobli for Harijans and others.

Q.—128. Mr. Ankam SANJEEVA SETTY (Channarayapatna—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) how many applications for grant of lands were received from (i) Harijans, (ii) non-Harijans; during the years 1938-39, 1939-40 and 1940-41 in Grama Hobli (Hassan Taluk).

(b) how many of these applications were for lands from Amrit Mahal Kaval and gomal lands;

(c) how many of these were granted;

(d) the reasons for non-grant to others?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprakashta B. T. Kesavalengar).—

Harijans

	1938-39	1939-40	1940-41
(a)	5	9	48
(b)	2	3	...
(c)	4	6	20